

DDS&T 5823-79

19 NOV 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel /  
FROM: Leslie C. Dirks  
Deputy Director for Science and Technology  
SUBJECT: NAPA Project Group Report  
REFERENCE: DDCI Memo dtd 5 Nov 79, same subject

1. I have reviewed the NAPA Project Group Report and generally concur with the majority of the recommendations. The report covered a wide spectrum of personnel management issues and the Project Group is to be commended for its obvious hard work and thoughtful approach to the review of the NAPA Team survey.

2. There are, however, certain recommendations which I feel may not be appropriate or are in need of amplification and others which I strongly endorse. These areas are addressed in the following comments which are keyed to Tabs contained in the report.

Tab D: Authorities of D/Pers

Comment: I concur in general with the recommendation if the Office of Personnel can implement within its existing manpower resource levels. Also, if implemented it would require an upgrading of its existing staff to perform control and enforcement functions.

Tab J: Vacancy Notice System

Comment: I do not agree with recommendation B of this Tab for the annual reporting of anticipated vacancies GS-15 and below for which fully qualified internal candidates will be considered and no vacancy notice issued. There are too many negative aspects in this recommendation when compared to the somewhat intangible benefits expected to be gained:

1. It would be difficult to make reasonably accurate projections.

2. Such projections would most probably be quickly outdated by continual changes in manpower requirements, reorganizations, etc.

3. It would further tax existing resources in OP and the individual components to control, monitor and respond to inquiries when vacancies may or may not materialize.

4. Announcing anticipated vacancies in advance could adversely impact on management's ability to effectively orchestrate planned personnel movements. (This could possibly cause undue concern on part of the incumbents, etc.)

Tab L: Occupational Career Systems

Comment: I do not agree entirely with Recommendation C of this section to advertise Agency wide all secretarial/clerical vacancies GS-08 and above. There are generally enough qualified candidates within each Directorate to support maintaining the current Directorate-wide system of advertising such vacancies. I do agree, however, with the second part of Recommendation C that a career service may not declare a secretarial/clerical (GS-08 and above) position vacant when it has an unassigned qualified employee of equivalent grade. Such a policy would facilitate the proper placement of these individuals.

Tab M: Rotational Assignment Policy

Comment: I believe Recommendation A of this section needs to be reworded to indicate that rotational assignments are not necessarily appropriate in all cases and may be counterproductive for certain types of employees, i. e., specialists.

Tabs N and O: Competitive Evaluation Panels and Decision Making Role of Panels

Comment: I fully endorse these two sections. The concept of giving line management the authority and responsibility to promote to the journeyman level is especially appropriate to elements in the DDS&T. Such a policy would greatly reduce the costs and man hours associated with the present panel structure while enhancing management's ability to

effectively perform its personnel management functions. If these sections are adopted, I suggest that Recommendation B of Tab N be modified to specify that Office Directors be given responsibility above the journeyman level through grade GS-14 for approving and documenting exceptions to panel recommendations and submitting annual reports to the Director of Personnel of these changes.

Tab P: Evaluation Panel Functions

Comment: I do not concur with doing completely away with descriptors as contained in Recommendation C of this Tab. There is, in my view, a need for some gradation in evaluating potential, particularly High Potential, Moderate Potential and Limited Potential.

Tab S: Flow-Through Policy

Comment: I question the benefits to be gained from Recommendations B and C of this section. It would be extremely difficult to do and could possibly be viewed as discriminating when establishing age and length of service criteria.

Tab U: Low Three Percent Out Concept

Comment: I agree that the present system may not be the most effective; however, there is a clear-cut need for some mechanism to identify and deal with marginal performers. I question that reliance on the Performance Appraisal Report, as suggested by the Project Group in this section, will suffice. Unless or until another method is proposed, I think we should continue with the present 3% policy.

  
Leslie C. Dirks

STATINTL